

A3350

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 11

believe, somehow, in a double standard of truth. His followers taught that what is true in philosophy may be false in theology, and vice versa: "True for you but not for me. True for me but not for you."

WAY TO CYNICISM

If such a system were valid it could lead to complete cynicism in our daily affairs. The initiates, the enlightened, would be winking at one another and smiling behind their hands as they passed on the streets.

"We are in the know," they would be thinking. "The rest of the world, poor boobies are paying, suffering, dying for what they think is right, but we know better."

That is why one gets uneasy when one reads that the press is considered an ally of the ruling class in every national crisis. It means that the press is to tell not necessarily the truth, not what is in the best interests of the people, but rather what their rulers want the people to think.

For an example here in the United States: Instinct, common sense, all our past experience and education from first grade up, demonstrate that we can't afford to be shovelling out billions of dollars all over the world. The whole giveaway program has been discredited so often that one gets weary hearing about it.

Now the press and practically all of our elected officials know these facts, and yet they vote the same disastrous program through each year without batting an eye, pushing the country closer and closer to fiscal catastrophe.

There are not two systems of truth. That much is certain. But there must be certain facts that are being withheld from the public. It is likely that when a man enters life he is "briefed" by his party leaders and told, perhaps, that our whole economy depends on the Giveaway, that we have to go on making heavy machinery and trucks even if only to dump them into the ocean—else hard times will return. Inflation? That is the more remote of the two evils: "We can cross that bridge when we come to it."

Recently we have been reading a great deal concerning the Central Intelligence Agency which, we are calmly told, "fights fire with fire," fomenting rebellions, toppling governments, parachuting agents behind enemy lines, and operating generally along the standard lines of a Grade-B movie. The complaint, oddly, is not that their methods are "un-American" or "un-democratic," but that they have not been successful.

It is "patriotism" in the CIA—"subversion" in any other group.

You run into this double standard constantly. Watching "Mein Kampf" on the screen the other day, I heard the narrator protest that Franco had conspired against the "legally elected" government of Spain.

Is it evil to plot against a "legally elected" government? But Hitler's government was at least as "legally elected," and so was Mussolini's. From the context, however, I judged that the narrator would not appreciate that particular application.

EICHMANN AND KHRUSHCHEV

Again: While Eichmann killed only Jews, Khrushchev killed just as many without bothering to make any racial distinction. The one used gas, the other used mass starvation. The one is being exhibited to the world in a glass cage, the other is being wine and dined in every capital of the world. Why? Evil for Eichmann, but not for Khrushchev?

But the most painful appearance of this ambiguity concerns our present war with Russia. On the front page we are told that we have just received a terrible humiliation at the hands of the enemy in Cuba, while that same enemy is pouring arms into Laos. President Kennedy called a special meeting of the Security Council to decide whether or not our American boys should be sent to

shed their blood in the Southeast. We are close to war. With whom? With Russia.

At the same time, "a happy throng" greeted a group of enemy "dancers" at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York—the Moiseyev Company: "The lively group from Moscow won the wild applause of a large audience of society, stage and movie celebrities, in a \$15 a seat, mink-and-chinchilla atmosphere that almost rivaled the annual opera opening. The Star Spangled Banner and the Hammer and Sickle hung side by side."

Also, Rear Adm. S. B. Frankel was squelched by the Defense Department when he wanted to give a talk to the people of Houston questioning the value of negotiations with the enemy.

LOYALTY IN PEACE CORPS

Also, when it was suggested that applicants for the proposed Peace Corps take an oath of loyalty to our country as one means of excluding the enemy from membership, the proposal was voted down.

Also, while Dr. Linus Pauling goes on propagandizing for enemy objectives, he still seems to be well thought of, draws big crowds to his lectures, and continues secure on the faculty at Caltech.

Then there is always Cyrus Eaton. As far as I know, he has not yet been ostracized or thrown out of any of his clubs, despite his seeming preference for the enemy over our own country.

Dr. Robert Oppenheimer admitted giving aid and comfort to the enemy. He has never explained this. Yet he is still an honored member of the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton.

To the best of my knowledge, Owen Lattimore is still teaching at Johns Hopkins in Baltimore.

Alger Hiss was the subject of a benign writeup last winter in Esquire, and a man who swore to Hiss' integrity and good reputation at the trial enjoys Cabinet rank as our Ambassador to the United Nations. Mr. Stevenson has never repudiated his opinion of Alger Hiss.

In recent weeks, the U.S. Government has stopped interpreting enemy propaganda mailed from abroad. This moves at your expense, gentle reader. It goes postage free in this country—17½ tons in 1 week through the San Francisco post office alone.

The Government has stopped fingerprinting aliens because the enemy does not like it.

The Government has lifted the ban on products of forced labor, so that now the enemy stands to get real profit from his slave camps.

Apparently, the enemy is regarded as an enemy only when he actually shoves a gun into an American belly in Laos, in Katanga, or in Berlin. Otherwise, why, he is an utterly charming ballet dancer, pianist, or physicist.

St. Thomas would certainly have a hard time understanding.

Failure of Attempted Rebellion in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Is Our Problem," which appeared April 21, 1961, in the Indianapolis Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT IS OUR PROBLEM

The Government and the public must face up to the fact that the smashing of the attempted rebellion in Cuba is a disaster. It would be foolish to console ourselves with explanations of why it might be considered otherwise.

The much-heralded invasion has been tried. The rebels could not make it stick. Much of the anti-Castro leadership inside Cuba necessarily will have been exposed during the period of fighting, and has been or will be destroyed. The mounting of the next attempt to overthrow Castro will be 10 times as difficult.

Castro has made good his boasts that he was ready to meet and crush any invasion. His stock and that of the Communists will soar throughout Latin America. Anti-American propagandists have been handed a windfall. Respect for the United States—and for U.S. strength—will be the butt of a new surge of attack.

Another fact to be faced is that the United States is involved. Manpower for the invasion was openly recruited on U.S. soil. Self-styled leaders of the rebellion have moved about U.S. cities openly and unhindered. Sympathy with the invaders was officially expressed in Washington. In the eyes of the whole world, the United States was at least a partisan, if not a participant, in this effort. The United States was defeated along with the starcrossed patriots who assaulted the beaches.

The interests of the United States are still bound up with whatever may be left of this rebellion, and with what may follow. The President has declared that the United States would stand on the Monroe Doctrine and its obligations to the hemisphere, and would not tolerate intervention in the rebellion by the Soviet Union or other outside powers.

Well, the Soviet Union, directly and through other Red powers, has intervened. The invaders were met with guns and planes and tanks that came from Communist plants in Europe and Asia. There are thousands of European and Chinese Communist technicians in Cuba.

If the invasion has been smashed and things become as they were in Cuba, more arms and more men will be sent to Cuba by the Communist powers.

What will the United States do about it?

If the Nation means to stand on the Monroe Doctrine, there is only one thing to do. The further arming and supplying of Cuba from Communist sources must be stopped. If it takes a blockade to do it, then a blockade should be established.

The hard question facing the President and Congress is whether the Communist intervention already accomplished in Cuba does not require, even now, steps to protect American interests and to renew the standing of the Monroe Doctrine.

Industrial Gains in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the fourth in a series of articles by Gaston Coblentz appearing in the

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3349

the Castro forces is a bitter blow to the United States, in several ways.

This country is being blamed for the uprising against Castro, and the world apparently is convinced that U.S. undercover work was involved. Even our allies, unofficially, and in the press, are assuming we had a hand in the revolution.

As long as we are to bear the brunt of unfavorable world opinion and publicity we might as well have won the battle. We are now in the position of having been judged at least partly guilty, without having any gain to show for the loss.

Obviously, the Russians will make great propaganda capital out of their threats to us—to stay out of the Cuban revolution—and our alleged timidity to defy them. And Castro's successful defense against an invasion—which he has been predicting for many months—will only strengthen his hold on Cuba.

It discourages others who would rebel and it solidifies his power with some of the population, since defending one's country against invasion is a popular rallying cry, even for demagogues and dictators.

It seems, then, that we have suffered a heavy blow in the recent events in Cuba and it would appear that someone pretty high up the line underestimated Castro's real strength and overestimated that of the rebels. It would have been far better for the United States if the revolt had not been launched until success was certain.

Gallaudet: The World's Only College for the Deaf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, since 1957 I have been privileged to serve as a member of the board of directors, representing the House, of Gallaudet College, the world's only college for deaf students.

I have been greatly impressed during this period at the sound and steady growth of the college. Its new buildings, modern equipment, and growing faculty and student body testify to the wisdom of the Congress in helping to support this uniquely important institution. Under the leadership of President Leonard M. Elstad, Gallaudet has more than justified the confidence which Congress placed in the importance of its mission.

My most recent visit to the college, Mr. Speaker, took place over the past weekend when I attended its second annual open house in observance of Better Hearing Month.

I wish it had been possible for more of our colleagues to attend the open house, to witness the demonstrations arranged by members of the Hearing and Speech Center, to see at firsthand the processes developed to counteract the loss of hearing and to develop lipreading skills and speech proficiency. It was a source of great encouragement to see what can be done to overcome the handicap of deafness.

But the source of Gallaudet's progress is not alone in the highly refined processes and techniques they have developed. It soon becomes clear to even the most casual visitor that the college's outstanding work is the product, fundamentally, of a devoted faculty and an enthusiastic student body—men and women, boys and girls who will let nothing stand in the way of leading full and productive lives in a time when our country needs the brains and talents of all our people.

In the interests of achieving a greater awareness of the valuable work being done by the people of Gallaudet College, I include as a part of my remarks the following United Press International story which appeared in the April 18 issue of the Newark (N.J.) Evening News.

COLLEGE FOR DEAF STUDENTS IS UNIQUE

WASHINGTON.—A short distance from the U.S. Capitol is a unique college where lectures are given simultaneously by voice and in sign language.

It is Gallaudet College, the only college for the deaf in the world. There professors and instructors must help ideas penetrate the soundless world of every individual student.

In the classroom a professor speaks clearly and distinctly, just as though his students had normal hearing. At the same time, he moves his hands rapidly, using a combination of sign language and the manual alphabet. This is known as the simultaneous method. The student is able to read the professor's lips as he is speaking, yet this alone is an inaccurate method of comprehension. What the student misses by lip-reading he is able to understand by watching the professor's hands spell the words or by his use of sign language.

USES FLASHING LIGHT

To attract student's attention, a professor uses a flashing white light. Nearly every room has two lights high on a wall. A flashing red light denotes danger. Deaf people are so sensitive to light that a flashing red light will awaken them from a sound sleep.

Gallaudet College is an accredited college operating as a private corporation, but it receives 70 percent of its operating funds from the U.S. Government through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The remaining funds come from tuition and grants.

Students are drawn from all over the world. India, Korea, Canada, England, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Vietnam are represented in the current student body, along with 47 U.S. States. Its modern buildings rest on a lush green campus. A varied program of instruction and an abundance of undergraduate activities are offered as in other colleges.

PLENTY OF ROOM

It has 391 students, the highest enrollment to date. The college has facilities to accommodate 1,000 students.

Amos Kendall, a member of Andrew Jackson's "kitchen cabinet" and later Postmaster General under Martin Van Buren, was responsible for its start. In 1857 Kendall found himself caring for handicapped children abandoned in the streets of Washington. At his farm 2 miles from the Capitol, he founded the Kendall School for the Deaf. He contributed a house and land, guaranteed the teachers' salaries, and later built a schoolhouse. He appointed Edward Minor Gallaudet to head the institution.

Seven years later, in 1864, Abraham Lincoln signed a special act establishing Gallaudet College as an institution with power to grant academic degrees.

Today students eagerly pursue courses in science, mathematics, social studies, romance languages and the humanities.

Participation in sports is compulsory for every student.

The college has an ultra-modern gymnasium and an Olympic-size swimming pool. Many students and faculty alike are looking forward to the ninth International Olympic Games for the Deaf which will be held in Helsinki, Finland, next August.

In the snack bar and lounge students gather to relax. They may be discussing their fraternities and sororities or a dance to be held on campus. The students enjoy dancing. They feel the vibrations of the music through the wooden floors.

Cuba
"Right or Wrong," by Father Ginder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, when the National Catholic Action Weekly Our Sunday Visitor first began coming to my office I, as a Protestant, gave it scant attention since I do not like to be proselytized any more than I think others like to be indoctrinated with my views.

In a casual reading of a recent issue, however, I chanced upon the column by Rev. Richard Ginder and since that time I have looked forward with increasing interest to his weekly articles. Father Ginder takes them all on—regardless of station or creed—and what I especially like is his utter indifference to the political complexion of the subject at hand. It should also be noted that most of his discussions are on secular matters and I have not yet found in his writings anything that has ruffled my religious sensibilities, even slightly.

His column in the current issue of this weekly is entitled "Double Standard in Our Modern World," and is commended to the attention of everyone who believes that we cannot have it both ways—that we cannot fight communism in Cuba and then take it to our bosom in the Metropolitan Opera House.

RIGHT OR WRONG—DOUBLE STANDARD IN OUR MODERN WORLD

(By Father Ginder)

It is interesting to read in the current issue of *Holiday* that "when major decisions affecting Britain's national life have to be taken," the answer is provided by a triumvirate: the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Prime Minister, and the editor of the *Times*. It is this third person who interests me for it clearly shows that there must be two aspects to each problem.

First: "How shall we handle it?"

Second: "What shall we tell the people?"

Indeed, as one ponders the news of the day, the mind goes back uneasily to the subtle error of Averroes in the 12th century which so horrified St. Thomas Aquinas that he concentrated all of his massive genius in one mighty effort to crush it forever. But is it staging a comeback?

Averroes, a Muslim, was a brilliant student of Aristotle. But his thinking led him to

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORDS AND SURVIVAL

(Transcript of "A Way of Thinking," with Dr. Albert Burke, Sunday, May 7, 1961)

Ling Chen, Chinese fisherman, about to make headlines around the world one night early in 1955. He's lost, and while trying to find his way home, paddles his sampan into a restricted defense area just off the Chinese Nationalist island of Matsu. The sentries on Matsu see him, and they fire a few warning shots over his head to get him out of there. He gets out—fast: and leaves behind a problem. This problem, here in the headlines which told about that incident the next morning. An American Army observer on Matsu saw that incident that night involving a Chinese sampan—but the next morning you read about a fleet of Chinese Communist war junks, carrying many men, sailing to Matsu in an invasion attempt. Those few warning shots are reported here as a night-long battle, during which the invasion was turned back, after the loss of many Communist ships and men.

What you read, and heard, in the news that morning was not true. What you read and heard that morning was managed news—deadly stuff, as we will get into this tonight—on a way of thinking about "Words and Survival."

A very important night in American history. The President of the United States speaks to the Nation in a special telecast to explain where we stand as a science power in the race for space with the Soviet Union. A month earlier, the U.S.S.R. had placed Sputnik I into orbit around the earth, taking man's first step into space. The Nation hadn't been prepared for this Soviet accomplishment, and it was troubled. How far behind Russia were we—if we were? What were we doing to catch up?

Mr. Eisenhower briefed the Nation about what had been done—what was being done—what would be done. It was a reassuring talk, and at no point was it more reassuring than when the President pointed to a kind of pyramid-shaped object several feet tall near his desk, and announced that it was a nose cone which had been recovered from a long-range missile which had come back to the earth's surface after traveling hundreds of miles into outer space. "Here it is," Mr. Eisenhower said, "completely unharmed. Intact. Our scientists and engineers have solved that problem."

That announcement made quite a few of the world's headlines, in a particularly important way. Because it meant that America's space science and technology had made about as important a step toward man's eventual exploration of space, as Soviet science and technology had done in sending Sputnik I into orbit. That announcement meant that we were not far behind the Russians. We were simply working on another part of a big problem. There, in that nose cone next to the President was proof. We had solved the reentry problem. The U.S.S.R. may have been first in putting a satellite in space, but we were first in bringing an object back from space. Now a man could be brought back one day from space. All this was quite clear in Mr. Eisenhower's special telecast that night in November 1957. Few of the Nation's press failed to carry that story—the part of it about the nose cone, at least. The President's facts had been given to him by the Defense Department. It was a good thing to hear. It made everybody feel much better about where we stood in the race for space with a Communist Russia. There was only one thing wrong with that announcement, though. It wasn't true. It was "managed news"—deadly stuff to any free people concerned about staying a free people.

Mr. Eisenhower did not manage that news about the nose cone in that special telecast. He was as much the victim of news that's only partly true as you or I. The fact about that nose cone was that it had come back from outer space into the earth's atmosphere at a speed slower than would have been necessary for what's called an operational long-range missile. At that lower speed, the re-entry problem had not been solved. It has been solved since then. It was not solved at the time of that telecast. You were not given the facts. Which touches the heart of the problem Mr. Kennedy pointed up in several important speeches during the month of April 1961. The gist of his remarks was: "The more I get to know the facts, the more I am convinced that we face the hour of maximum danger in our history—the problem of the survival of our way of life—not so much because of what the Communists are doing to win the future, but because of what we are not willing to do." This is strong talk and it leads to a strong question: the one pointed up in this pamphlet put out by the House Subcommittee on Government Information. According to testimony given before this committee, there are now more than a million Americans in Government who have the right to use this stamp—to keep you from knowing the facts that make this hour what President Kennedy has called America's hour of maximum danger. These are not just facts about how to build a hydrogen bomb, or missile guidance systems, or where our ICBM sites are—not just operational facts which no sensible American would want to know about, or would expect to know about, for obvious security reasons. This stamp is used to keep you from knowing about non-operational things, which have nothing to do with security—from statistics about peanut production to information about the States over which migratory birds fly every year. From the kind of furniture we put into our military transport planes, to the names of farmers paid not to grow certain foods under one or another agricultural program.

The question pointed up by this pamphlet is: Is it possible that managed news—in which Americans are given only such facts as certain people, or agencies in and out of Government decide they should know—is it possible that managed news can't pass on to the average American citizen the sense of urgency, the sense of danger to our way of life, which leaders in Government from Mr. Kennedy on down know? Can it be that what a free people, in a free society, do not know, can hurt them—and the Nation?

This has been an important question before the Nation, almost from the start, as for example, Thomas Jefferson was concerned about when he asked this man, Philip Freneau, to come to Philadelphia back in 1791. Philip Freneau played an enormously important but little known part in American history. The part of a critic, through his newspaper, which was called the National Gazette. Jefferson asked Freneau to set up shop in Philadelphia, which was the Nation's Capital at the time, because the young Republic wasn't going well. There were strong pressures in the then United States to have the Republic changed over into a monarchy. Those pressures were particularly strong in Philadelphia, where they were backed by a Federalist newspaper. Freneau was this Nation's first opposition editor. He proved Jefferson's faith that in a free market of ideas, through the competition of ideas, lay the best safeguard for that day's Republic. Freneau's criticism of that day, according to Jefferson saved the Republic. He showed what power a critical press could have in public affairs.

Now, the important thing about that historical incident involving Freneau back in 1791 is that word criticism. Because that

word played a very important part in saving this democratic republic at other, earlier hours of maximum danger in our history, when it had a different meaning than it has today. Right at the heart of today's hour of maximum danger for this Nation is the fact that the word "criticize" has practically become a dirty word. To criticize is to condemn, for people who do not know what any good dictionary will point out—that the word has two meanings: the more important of which is to evaluate with knowledge. To judge, with knowledge. To review, with knowledge. To question, with knowledge. To get at the facts, to get at the truth. Although a kind of American history too many of today's Americans have never learned, the Philip Freneaus and our free press have criticized their way through our hours of maximum danger through wars, national scandals, like Teapot Dome, corruption—from the Boss Tweeds to the Hoffas—to get a better democratic product. There has been no more important word in the history of this Nation. There is no more neglected, unused word in the Nation today.

As it was neglected and unused in that nose cone incident back in 1957, and in this growing problem of managed news in Government right now—by that very special group of Americans with a very special license to exercise a very special responsibility: the license of the first amendment to safeguard the Republic, by that special group, the press. How many members of the press know enough about the new science of rockets and missiles to realize there was something not quite right about the Defense Department's managed news about a solved re-entry problem back in 1957. How many are prepared now to evaluate with knowledge the kind of news that's given out about our space program: about our place in the world as a science power? How many journalists, editors and publishers understand and believe what James Madison said when he welcomed Philip Freneau to Philadelphia as an opposition editor back in 1791, "that a popular government, without popular information or the means to get it, is but a prologue to a farce, a tragedy, or both." How many journalists editors and publishers, particularly those in the 20 States of this country where not a single city or town has an opposition paper, how many know that President Madison's words were never truer, than they are right now? For reasons we will tackle after a short break.

A very few Americans, perhaps numbered in dozens, knew that just outside the Manchurian village of Wan-Pao-Shan the prologue to a tragedy was written the morning of June 27, 1931. The prolog began when on that morning, a man named Nakamura—Captain Nakamura of the Imperial Japanese Army—was shot and killed by a Chinese soldier. That shot wasn't important enough to be mentioned in this Nation's press, that day in 1931. But by 1941 it was very much in our news. Ten years later, because of what had happened to a man there Americans didn't know, in a place they had never heard of—their lives were disrupted. And their world changed permanently. That bullet fired in 1931 touched off the Chinese-Japanese war, which led directly to Pearl Harbor. The line of history from a Japanese Army officer killed in 1931, to 390,000 Americans killed during World War II, was a direct line. This wasn't clear to us before Pearl Harbor. There was every reason to think it would be after World War II.

There was, until something happened again over in China, which made very clear that the lesson starting with Nakamura and running through to World War II, hadn't been learned too well. It happened during what history books now used in Europe describe as the second 10 days that shook the world. What happened was this—on a side

Television in its young life has had many hours of greatness—its Victory at Sea, its Army-McCarthy hearings, its Peter Pan, its Kraft Theaters, its See It Now, its Project 20, the World Series, its political conventions and campaigns, the Great Debates—and it has had its endless hours of mediocrity and its moments of public disgrace. There are estimates that today the average viewer spends about 200 minutes daily with television, while the average reader spends 38 minutes with magazines and 40 minutes with newspapers. Television has grown faster than a teen-ager, and now it is time to grow up.

What you gentlemen broadcast through the people's air affects the people's taste, their knowledge, their opinions, their understanding of themselves and of their world. And their future.

The power of instantaneous sight and sound is without precedent in mankind's history. This is an awesome power. It has limitless capabilities for good—and for evil. And it carries with it awesome responsibilities, responsibilities which you and I cannot escape.

In his stirring inaugural address our President said, "And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

Ladies and gentlemen, ask not what broadcasting can do for you. Ask what you can do for broadcasting.

I urge you to put the people's airwaves to the service of the people and the cause of freedom. You must help prepare a generation for great decisions. You must help a great Nation fulfill its future.

Do this, and I pledge you our help.

THE RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED TO

Mr. PROXMIER. Madam President, yesterday the New York Times carried two eloquent expositions on the necessity for governmental frankness and honesty in dealing with the press in our democracy.

One was a fine editorial, the other an article by the Times head of its Washington bureau, Mr. James Reston. I ask unanimous consent that both these items be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 10, 1961]

THE RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED TO

The Cuban tragedy has raised a domestic question that is likely to come up again and again until it is solved. The cause may be something that is happening in Laos, in central Africa or in Latin America, but the question remains the same: is a democratic government in an open society such as ours ever justified in deceiving its own people?

In this period of cold war, with its nightmares of hot war just around the corner, there must be secrets kept from the American public in order to preserve them from our adversaries. The Central Intelligence Agency is specifically authorized to "correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government." The existence of the cold war implies secret operations on our side in self-defense against the normal subversive operations of the other side that cannot be revealed, nor would the responsible American press want to reveal them.

But the Government has a duty also. Neither prudence nor ethics can justify any administration in telling the public things that are not so. A year ago this month, when an American plane was shot down over Russia, the State Department said that

"there was no deliberate attempt to violate Soviet space and there never has been." This wasn't true. It was not even usefully untrue, for the Russians already held the pilot, Francis Gary Powers, and had secured a confession from him.

The recent Cuban episode has not been so clear. As has been reported in this and other newspapers, there is no doubt that men were recruited in this country for the projected attack on Cuba. The fact was well known in and around Miami prior to the attack and could not be kept secret from Castro's own spies.

What some leaders of our Government stated in this regard did not square with the facts. If they could not reveal the facts, they would have done better to remain silent. A democracy—our democracy—cannot be lied to. This is one of the factors that make it more precious, more delicate, more difficult and yet essentially stronger than any other form of government in the world.

The basic principle involved is that of confidence. A dictatorship can get along without an informed public opinion. A democracy cannot. Not only is it unethical to deceive one's own public as part of a system of deceiving an adversary government; it is also foolish. Our executive officers and our national legislators are elected on stated days, but actually they must be reelected day by day by popular understanding and support.

This is what is signified by a government by consent.

[From the New York Times, May 10, 1961]

THE PRESIDENT AND THE PRESS—THE OLD DILEMMA

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 9—When President Kennedy invited the newspaper editors and publishers to the White House today his concern was precisely the same as George Washington's complaint against the press 183 years ago this month.

"It is much to be wished," General Washington wrote to the President of the Congress in May of 1777, "that our printers were more discreet in many of their publications. We see in almost every paper * * * accounts transmitted to the enemy of an injurious nature."

The need for discretion is obviously greater today. President Kennedy is engaged in an underground war all over the world. Most of his moves are publicized while his enemies' moves are concealed. The American press has a publish and be damned tradition, highly skeptical of Government power, especially concealed power, and unlike the British press it does not have to worry about a severe libel law or an official secrets act.

THE DISADVANTAGES

Accordingly, the United States clearly operates this kind of dirty-tricks war at a disadvantage, and when things are going badly, as they now are, it is easy to get the whole thing out of perspective.

The Cuban fiasco illustrates the point. This whole operation was not only planned, financed and armed by the Central Intelligence Agency, a branch of the Federal Government, but CIA officials imprisoned the Cuban refugee leaders during the landings and put out misleading information in their name.

When the landings started, American reporters in Miami were told that this was an invasion of around 5,000 men—this for the purpose of creating the impression among the Cuban people that they should rise up to support a sizable invasion force.

When the landing, not of 5,000 but of around 1,000 men, began to get in trouble, however, officials here in Washington put out the story—this time to minimize the defeat in the minds of the American people—that there was no invasion at all, but merely

a landing of some 200-400 men to deliver supplies to anti-Castro guerrillas already in Cuba.

Both times the press was debased for the Government's purpose. Both times the Castro government and its Soviet advisers knew from their own agents in the anti-Castro refugee camps and from their own observation on the beaches that these pronouncements were false and silly. And both times the American people were the only ones to be fooled.

It is therefore one thing to ask the press not to publish information about specific landings or weapons, and another to encourage the press to publish information known by the Government to be false.

Officials here not only encouraged the publication of false information on the Cuban exercise but resented publication of the fact that the CIA actually imprisoned Cuban refugees because the latter didn't like the way the CIA was running the show.

A POOR EXAMPLE

It is unfortunate, in a way, that President Kennedy chose to raise this problem of a free press in a cold war immediately after the Cuban episode. For while it is a serious general problem, Cuba is a poor example. The trouble with the press during the Cuban crisis was not that it said too much, but that it said too little. It knew what was going on ahead of the landing. It knew that the U.S. Government was breaking its treaty commitments and placing the reputation of the United States in the hands of a poorly trained and squabbling band of refugees.

This same press roared with indignation when Britain and France broke their treaty commitments to invade Suez, but it had very little to say about the morality, legality or practicality of the Cuban adventure when there was still time to stop it.

If the press had used its freedom during this period to protest, it might have been influential even in the White House, where, instead, it was being encouraged to put out false information and was actually putting it out.

No doubt the press does have to learn greater restraint than in the days when the United States was an isolated country, but the Government has to do the same. For the truth that makes men free is very often the truth they do not like to hear and also the truth that the Government does not like to see published either.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to announce that I associate myself with the sentiments expressed in the editorial from the New York Times just presented for printing in the RECORD by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER].

DR. ALBERT BURKE'S ELOQUENT PLEA FOR IMPROVED PUBLIC INFORMATION

Mr. PROXMIER. Madam President, Dr. Albert Burke has rapidly become one of the most profound and eloquent commentators on the American scene. Dr. Burke's programs appear Sunday nights on a number of television stations. He is the former dean of graduate studies at Yale University.

His broadcast last Sunday was one of the finest expositions I have seen of the importance at this stage of history of a more honestly and fully informed American public.

I ask unanimous consent that the script of Dr. Burke's broadcast be printed in the RECORD at this point.